REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-6 are pending in the application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3 and 6 have been amended. It is submitted that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated December 27, 2007.

Claim Objections

On page 3 of the Action, claim 3 is objected as including incorrect dependency.

This objection is traversed. It is respectfully submitted that such errors have been corrected by the present Amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1 and 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto et al. (USP 7,177,523) in view of Okabayashi et al. (USP 6,751,399).

This rejection is traversed. Claim 1, as amended, now recites (a) "*a second reproducer for reproducing one screen of still image signal from said recording medium, without waiting for a lapse of said timer, every time that the image renewal instruction is issued*" and (b) "*an issuer for issuing an image renewal instruction in response to the period changing instruction, wherein said issuer issues the image renewal instruction when the period changing instruction is for shortening the image reproducing period and said issuer stops issuing the image renewal instruction when the period changing instruction is for extending the image reproducing period.*" Also, independent claim 6 has been amended to include the similar features.

This amendment for the features (a) is supported by the specification (page 2, lines 14-16 and page 7, lines 19-20) as well as Fig. 6, step S27. Also, the amendment for the features (b) is supported by the specification (page 2, lines 24-25).

With regard to the above-mentioned features (a), the Examiner alleges that Matsumoto discloses reproducing one image every 500 msec, every 250 msec and every 50 msec by relying on column 5, line 37 to column 6, line 51 of Matsumoto (page 4, item 4 of the Action). In other words, the Examiner appears to allege that Matsumoto discloses a system in which an image renewal instruction is issued every 500 msec, every 250 msec or every 50 msec, then the image is renewed by the issued image renewal instruction.

However, Matsumoto discloses different structures from the features of "*a second reproducer for reproducing one screen of still image signal from said recording medium, without waiting for a lapse of said timer, every time that the image renewal instruction is issued.*"

Matsumoto discloses a device that reproduces and displays an image. A renewal unit renews the image at some interval. The device changes the interval in accordance with the number of images recorded on a recording medium and the number of images renewed by the renewal unit (see Abstract). Fig. 2 discloses how to decide the value of "KEY TIMER" in accordance with the number of images recorded and the number of images renewed. This "KEY TIMER" is set as e.g., 500 msec as alleged by the Examiner (column 6, lines 16-18).

However, as clearly described in the steps "S07" and "S08" of Fig. 2 of Matsumoto, the displayed image is renewed only when the timer count value of the "KEY TIMER" reaches zero, that is, the timer elapses (see also column 5, lines 23-27).

Therefore, Matsumoto is silent regarding the features (a) "*a second reproducer for reproducing one screen of still image signal from said recording medium, without waiting for a lapse of said timer, every time that the image renewal instruction is issued,*" as now called for in amended claim 1 and similarly in amended claim 6.

With regard to the above-mentioned features (b), the Examiner clearly acknowledges the drawbacks and deficiencies of Matsumoto, that is, Matsumoto does not disclose "*said issuer stops issuing the image renewal instruction when the period changing instruction is for extending the image reproducing period.*"

In an attempt to cure the above-noted drawbacks and deficiencies of Matsumoto, the Examiner relies on the teachings of Okabayashi, particularly still picture table and alleges that Okabayashi teaches "wherein said issuer stops issuing the image renewal instruction when the period changing instruction is for extending the image reproducing period" (page 5, item 5 of the Action). Also, the Examiner alleges that:

> Okabayashi teaches the use of a still picture table (fig. 5B). The picture table represents the reproduction speed for the reproducer, the reproducing period ranges from 5 seconds to 0.03 seconds. Since Okabayashi discloses a range of reproduction speeds, it is clear that the change in speed can be extended or reduced (see page 3, second paragraph of the Action).

However, the Examiner appears to mischaracterize the above-mentioned features (b) as just changing the image reproducing period to shorter or longer by the period changing instruction and inadvertently omit the other recitations. In the present claimed invention, the issuer determines whether the period changing instruction is for shortening the image reproducing period or extending the image reproducing period, then if it is for shortening the image reproducing period, issues the image renewal instruction. Upon receiving the issued image renewal instruction, a second reproducer reproduces one screen of still image signal, without waiting for a lapse of said timer. On the contrary, if the period changing instruction is for extending the image reproducing period, the issuer stops issuing the image renewal instruction.

To clarify this point, claim 1 has been amended into (b) "*an issuer for issuing an image renewal instruction in response to the period changing instruction, wherein said issuer issues the image renewal instruction when the period changing instruction is for shortening the image reproducing period and said issuer stops issuing the image renewal instruction when the period changing instruction is for extending the image reproducing period.*"

As admitted by the Examiner, Fig. 5B of Okabayashi discloses gradual reproduction speeds ranging from 5 seconds to 0.03 seconds. However, for each reproduction speed, corresponding "counter comparison value" is defined in Fig. 5B. In the operation, as described in Fig. 6, the "counter comparison value" is read out in the step "S7" and compared to "reset field counter" in the step "S8." If the "reset field counter" reaches the read-out "counter comparison value," the image is renewed by renewing memory address in the step "S9" (see also column 7, lines 24-36).

In other words, in Okabayashi, the image is renewed whenever the "reset field counter" reaches the read-out "counter comparison value" whether or not the reproduction speed is changed to lower (that is, the image reproducing period is extended) or higher. Therefore, Okabayashi is silent and different from the claimed features of (b) "*an issuer for issuing an image renewal instruction in response to the period changing instruction, wherein said issuer issues the image renewal instruction when the period changing instruction is for shortening the image reproducing period and said issuer stops issuing the image renewal instruction when the period changing instruction is for extending the image reproducing period.*"

Furthermore, the Examiner's primary reference of Matsumoto discloses a similar system in which the image is renewed whenever the timer count value reaches zero, that is, the timer elapses (see Fig. 2 and column 5, lines 23-27).

In view of the above, it is submitted that even if, assuming *arguendo*, that Matsumoto may be combined with Okabayashi in the manner suggested by the Examiner, such combination would still fail to disclose or fairly suggest the claimed feature of (b) "*an issuer for issuing an image renewal instruction in response to the period changing instruction, wherein said issuer issues the image renewal instruction when the period changing instruction is for shortening the image reproducing period and said issuer stops issuing the image renewal instruction when the period changing instruction is for extending the image reproducing period,*" as now called for in amended claim 1 and similarly in amended claim 6.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 6 distinguish over Matsumoto and Okabayashi.

Claims 3-5 are dependent from claim 1 and recite the additional features set forth therein. Accordingly, claims 3-5 also distinguish over Matsumoto and Okabayashi for at least the reasons set forth above.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

Thomas E. Brown
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,450
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

TEB/TN/ya